

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

<p><b>MAURICE AUBERTIN,</b></p> <p>v.</p> <p><b>CORE CIVIC, INC., et al.,</b></p>	<p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>Plaintiff, )</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>Defendants. )</p>
---	--

**No. CIV 22-033-Raw-Jar**

**OPINION AND ORDER**  
**DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL**

Plaintiff has filed a letter which the Court construed as a motion requesting the Court to appoint counsel (Dkt. 4).<sup>1</sup> He bears the burden of convincing the Court that his claim has sufficient merit to warrant such appointment. *McCarthy v. Weinberg*, 753 F.2d 836, 838 (10th Cir. 1985) (citing *United States v. Masters*, 484 F.2d 1251, 1253 (10th Cir. 1973)). The Court has carefully reviewed the merits of Plaintiff's claims, the nature of factual issues raised in his allegations, and his ability to investigate crucial facts. *McCarthy*, 753 F.2d at 838 (citing *Maclin v. Freake*, 650 F.2d 885, 887-88 (7th Cir. 1981)). After considering Plaintiff's ability to present his claims and the complexity of the legal issues raised by the claims, the Court finds that appointment of counsel is not warranted. See *Williams v. Meese*, 926 F.2d 994, 996 (10th Cir. 1991); see also *Rucks v. Boergermann*, 57 F.3d 978, 979 (10th Cir. 1995).

**ACCORDINGLY**, Plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel (Dkt. 4) is DENIED.

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff is advised that any future requests for relief must be in the form of a proper motion--not a letter--in accordance with Rule 7(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Civil Rule 7.1(b).

**IT IS SO ORDERED** this 20<sup>th</sup> day of April 2021.



---

HONORABLE RONALD A. WHITE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA